ART. XVI. *A Treatise on the Lues Bovilla, or Cow-Pox.* By Benjamin Moseley, M.D., Physician to the Royal Military Hospital of Chelsea, &c. 2d Edition, with considerable Additions. 8vo. pp. 142. 5s. sewed. Longman and Co. 1805.

THE respectable rank in the profession which Dr. Moseley holds, as Physician to a great national establishment, might justify much higher pretensions than such as are supported by the merits of the treatise before us. We have seldom seen a work which bore, more distinctly than the present, the stamp of an intemperate endeavour to carry beyond the reach of rational investigation, a subject of the highest importance to mankind; and we cannot sufficiently reprehend the disposition, which so universally appears through the whole of this performance, to impose on the judgment of the public, by the substitution of bold assertion and illiberal invective, for a candid and philosophical inquiry after truth. With those who have time and disposition to examine, this publication bears too many internal evidences of error to mislead: but where it is merely known that a Physician of standing and respectability comes forwards, with an appearance of candour, of zeal for the honour of his profession, and regard to the interests of the public, to stem the torrent of popular prepossession, by what are represented to be unquestionable facts and incontrovertible reasoning, it becomes the more necessary to put in a caveat, if there be any circumstances connected with his work which diminish our confidence in its accuracy.

In the very first page of the preface, we find an observation which gives no flattering idea of the author's judgment. He there tells us that it is his firm opinion 'that experience is not necessary to know, the cow-pox cannot be a preventive to the small-pox.—For on the principles of pathology, and analogy; from the laws of the animal œconomy, and the want of reciprocity between the two diseases, it is impossible to believe, without an entire subversion of our reason, that either should render the human frame unsusceptible of the other.' It requires but little philosophy to know that we are not intitled to infer any thing but from experience. Analogy is frequently delusive; it may be employed with caution in the absence of direct evidence: but it would be the height of extravagance to conceive that it can supersede fact, or render inquiry unnecessary. We presume that Dr. Moseley is not apprized of the nature of that constitutional change, which produces unsusceptibility to small-pox in those who have gone through that disease; and we take it for granted that he would hardly venture a conjecture on those minute differences in organization which

which existed before and after its attack. Until he is able to inform us on these points, and to prove that the ultimate changes in organization, effected by small-pox and by cow-pox, are not the same, he will go but a little way in his attempt to interrupt vaccine inoculation, by any thing but an appeal to facts and experiments.

The Doctor is obliged to admit that cow pox lessens, for a time, the disposition to receive small-pox: but he says that in this it does no more 'than the Scaldhead; or a violent state of the Itch; or the Yaws; or the Leprosy; or the *Pustule Maligne*; or the temporary influence of any morbid inoculation from diseased animals; or the bites of venomous creatures; or wounds, that dissecters of dead bodies sometimes accidentally give themselves.' When we hear an *à priori* argument gravely employed against the possibility of cow-pox doing what it is pretended that it can effect, is it not fair to ask, what is the minute and essential difference between an action which produces a change of impression for a short time only, and that which keeps up the change for a long series of years, or for life? It will hardly be asserted that there is an affinity between small-pox, and any of those complaints which are enumerated as affording a temporary protection against it; nor is it at all necessary to concede that such affinity should also exist between that disease and cow-pox, in order to render the one a preventative of the other. Dr. Moseley is a friend to analogy: but, while he has recourse to it where it can have no place, he omits to apply it when he can do so with propriety. He tells us that he has the fullest conviction, that the quality of variolous matter used for inoculation will not influence the quality of the disease arising from it; and that, if a subject in the small-pox have 'inveterate Scurvy, Scrophula, Itch, Syphilitic infection, or Consumption, matter may be taken from it for inoculation, with as much safety as if none of these disorders had been present:' but what peculiarity can he prove in the case of the matter of cow-pox, to justify the supposition that this is not governed by similar laws with other animal poisons? As the idea which he entertains on this subject is repugnant to the usual course of nature, it may be justly retorted that it 'has been adopted in open defiance of every principle of pathology and of analogy in medicine.'

The author seems to be anxious to prove that vaccine inoculation teems with evils of every description. Its ravages are even not to be confined to the corporeal part, like those of its prototype of Pandora. This modern Prometheus hesitates at receiving the proffered gift on account of its bestial origin, and makes many amusing though indelicate allusions to the probable

bable ‘ mutations’ which may be produced on the human character, by ‘ quadrupedan sympathy.’

Dr. M. advises an anti-cowpox-author to ‘ imitate the alligator, on entering the lists; and to swallow a great deal of dirt before the combat, to enable him to sink his antagonist in the mud.’ This piece of advice it might fairly be expected that he himself would practise, were it not readily discernible that it is unnecessary for the purpose of enabling him to cloud the elements of controversy; for his constant dread of the ‘ paroxysms of belluous fury,’ produced by the ‘ brutal’ influence of cow-pox, has given rise to such a sensorial fermentation, as we doubt not will be sufficient for all the purposes of contest, during the whole of a long protracted literary warfare.

Dr. Moseley asserts, with an imposing confidence, that none among the middle and inferior ranks of society in the metropolis, unless attacked by surprise or with threats, or cajoled by artifice, will now expose their children to cow-pox inoculation. What may have been the means employed by anti-vaccinists to stifle all inquiry into the nature and effects of cow-pox, we know not: but the insinuation here made is offensive and disgraceful, and it comes within our own knowlege to be able to contradict the unqualified assertion combined with it.

The whole of the 1st part of this treatise is occupied with general remarks on cow pox, which are lively and amusing, though for the most part sarcastic and illiberal; with the evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, of medical men on Dr. Jenner's petition; and with the history of the measures which have been adopted to bring vaccination into practice. The 2d part is intended to prove, 1st, that the cow-pox is not a security against the small-pox; 2dly, that the cow-pox gives rise to many serious complaints, which do not occur from variolous inoculation; and 3dly, that it does not afford any prospect of exterminating small-pox.

It does not belong to our province to examine into the accuracy of all the evidence stated respecting the occurrence of small-pox after cow-pox. Dr. Moseley mentions many cases of this kind, which it is not necessary to particularize; and he informs us that he has nearly 1000 instances more by him, of the mischief and failure of cow-pox, which he will take care shall be laid before the world.—Such a mass of evidence proves too much; and it must tend to affect the doubts of many who were even unbelievers in vaccination. To suppose that there is only one virtuous physician in the metropolis, who will step forwards as the champion of truth, and that there is a general system of fraud pursued by the profession in order to mislead, are opinions as singular as that it should have happened only to

one

one man, or set of men, to see instances of failure, which others have in vain tried to produce. When it is known that the individual who thus presents himself has been a decided enemy to vaccination from the commencement,—that he has condemned, as useless and absurd, any examination into its efficacy,—and that he has been anxious to vilify and decry it by every means in his power,—it may well be asked whether such a person, who does not, by his own admission, know any thing about cow-pox practically, has the common qualifications for examining into and collecting evidence on the subject? Would Dr. Moseley himself have been inclined to give implicit credit to the cases adduced by the furious opponents of variolous inoculation? and would he not rather have preferred the evidence of personal experience, and the testimony of men who, at least, carried with them the appearance of candour? Pertinacious opposition is always to be suspected; and we doubt even whether the delicate remedy for ophthalmia, mentioned in a note to page 86, and recommended for the committee who reported on the cases at Fullwood's Rents, would be able to clear the eyes of Dr. Moseley and his friends, sufficiently to capacitate them for accurate and dispassionate observation on the subject of cow-pox.

We have already made some remarks on the occurrence of small-pox after vaccine inoculation *, and the effects which this occurrence should have on the practice. To those, therefore, we shall refer our readers; only observing at present that, though we feel satisfied as to the general preventative powers of cow-pox, we by no means are of opinion that inquiry into the extent of it ought to be prevented. Let adverse cases be examined with attention and candour; and let it be the endeavour of medical men to discover what proportion the cases, in which small-pox occurs after cow-pox, bear to those in which small-pox appears a second time. The possibility of the latter is denied by the present author, but we believe it to be irrefragable. Dr. Moseley gives a long catalogue of evil consequences resulting from vaccine inoculation: but, from the cases which he adduces in support of them, he seems to us to ascribe to the effects of that practice every complaint which comes on within many months afterward. He appears to be easily satisfied with evidence of the inefficacy or danger of cow-pox, but sets at nought every document of an opposite nature. Death by cow-pox he mentions as a common event: but we cannot so readily forget the uniform mildness of its symptoms observed

* See the account of Mr. Goldson's pamphlet, M. R. for November last.

by

by other practitioners, as to place any reliance on the unqualified expressions which the author employs to evince its malignity and danger.

We shall have occasion to mention, in another part of this number, the result of a few inquiries into the accuracy of Dr. Moseley's statements; and from these we are by no means inclined to consider his statements as possessing any claims to accuracy. We have no doubt that some friends to humanity will continue the investigation; in which, however, it is hardly necessary to do more than to shew in a few instances an inattention to correctness, in order to remove the impression which the other cases may effect.

It is matter of much regret to us that a physician, and a physician moving in a respectable sphere, should join with some of the lowest and most unworthy pretenders to medical character in an outcry against vaccination.--We are friends to discussion, and we think that manly opposition is to be encouraged as favourable to the discovery of truth: but the spirit uniformly shewn by Dr. Moseley on the subject of cow-pox is highly unworthy of him, and such as we hope he will in time blush to recollect.

What will future enlightened ages think of those narrow-minded bigots, those persecutors, Professors Robinson and Hornsby?

'I have lately made an offer to the Vice-Chancellor Hornsby, and Profesor Robinson, at the University of Oxford, to reconcile these sciences, and make them coincide; but this proposal was rejected, and these gentlemen would neither hear themselves, nor suffer their students to attend a lecture on this grand national subject: what then must the reader think of these learned Professors, who set their faces against an improvement of such importance to our commerce, and to our national defence – the navy?'

The consummation of the overthrow of the Newtonian Philosophy takes place in this paraphrase:

> "Nature and Nature's laws of old were known
> Ere proud Philosophers had built their throne;
> God's holy truth shone forth divinely bright,
> Before great *Newton* flourish'd, – *there was light.*"

We now take our leave, in tolerably good humour; yet we cannot help suggesting to Mr. Parkes and his fellow-labourer in the same cause, that, when the fever of writing and refutation again comes on, some wholesome restraints might be applied by medical friends.

Art. 18. *A Collection of Mathematical Tables*, for the Use of Students in Universities and Academies, for the practical Navigator, Geo-

We meet in this essay with little that is new, except Latin class-names for clouds under their different modifications. There is surely something of ludicrous importance in classifying and defining, with Linnéan formality, and in choice Latin, the tribe of clouds, of which the varieties are only seven. In the author's philosophy, we do not find much that calls for remark.

Art. 21. *A Map illustrative of the Changes of the Planet Venus*, in respect to her apparent Situation in the Heavens (as seen from the Earth) East or West of the Sun; and whereby she becomes successively an Evening and a Morning Star. 8vo. 1s. Allen.

We are at a loss to imagine a reasonable pretext for the appearance of this map. A person might, with equal grounds of propriety, select from some book on Astronomy, an Account and Explanation of the Lunar Phases.

Art. 22. *Six Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Perspective*, as applicable to Drawing from Nature, accompanied with a Mechanical Apparatus. By John George Wood. 4to. pp. 77. and separate Apparatus. 1l. 15s. Boards. Faulders.

The chief difficulty of demonstrating the Rules of Perspective consists in this, that diagrams inadequately represent solid bodies; and we think that, in a theoretical treatise of perspective, schemes made of pasteboard, of three dimensions, might be introduced with great advantage to the Student. The intention of the author of this treatise is not, however, to demonstrate the Rules of Perspective geometrically, but to teach the rules practically; and to make the reason of such rules, by the aid of an apparatus, sensible and apparent. This plan of practically teaching Perspective strikes us as eligible; and it appears to us that the examples in the present apparatus may be of more use than a hundred examples given on a plane. The machinery is simple, but, for obvious reasons, we do not undertake to describe it. Considering the price of the whole, however, we apprehend that the author might have afforded an apparatus of better workmanship.

As we have already mentioned, this work is not designed for those who wish to study Perspective mathematically: the author indeed frequently talks of proof and demonstration, but goes no farther in this arduous line, than by desiring the reader to look through the eye-hole of his machinery, or to trace a figure with chalk on the blank glass.

We cannot quit this subject without making two observations: 1st, that writers on Perspective, by multiplied examples, curious cases, and fine engravings, give a price to their works beyond all measure and propriety; and secondly, that they exalt too highly the practical utility of their art. The Architectural Designer ought to know Perspective in all its nicetics: but, in Painting, extreme exactness in delineation is not required: the former represents objects on a plane, knowing their shape and their situation with respect to the plane: the painter represents objects as they appear to him, and is regardless whether the round figure before his eye be, by mensuration, an exact circle or not.

MEDICAL.

Art. 23. *Observations on some late Attempts to depreciate the Value and Efficacy of Vaccine Inoculation.* By Samuel Merriman. 8vo. pp. 35. 1s. 6d. Murray. 1805.

In this judicious and well-written pamphlet, the author not only combats with force and success much of Dr. Moseley's reasoning against the propriety of vaccine inoculation *, but shews that, in some cases into which inquiry has been made, Dr. M. has not been correct in his statement of facts. The following observations are intended to contradict an insinuation which it has been attempted to enforce, that some interested motive is at the bottom of every endeavour to promote and extend the practice of vaccine inoculation:

'Nothing is more clearly demonstrable than the contrary. Every medical man, who practises or recommends Vaccination, is a loser by his philanthrophy. Exclusive of the very great number of persons whose children have been vaccinated gratuitously, (and among them are many who used to pay for variolous inoculation) those, who formerly gave large fees, give now much smaller ones, and among the middling classes, the fee is generally diminished one half: – add to this, that the diffusion of the Small Pox by contagion, a very considerable source of profit, is almost at an end. These severe losses are, however submitted to without a murmur, by a very great majority of practitioners, who, to their honor be it spoken, suffer not the desire of gain to prevail over the dictates of their conscience, and the desire of doing good. Can the opposers of Vaccination lay their hands on their hearts, and declare that they are influenced by the same honest motives?'

Mr. M. compares the opposition made to variolous with that which was made to vaccine inoculation; and he shews that the same objections of inefficacy and constitutional injury were as violently urged by those who resisted the introduction of the former, as they now are by those who oppose the latter practice. 'Notwithstanding, however, the decided opposition which was so steadily made to the progress of Inoculation,—notwithstanding the adverse cases which were published and reported against it, the intrinsic value of the practice, and its generally successful issue, caused it at last to obtain universal approbation. The Wagstaffe's the Massey's, and the Howgrave's died and were forgotten; their works are only remembered as examples of illiberality, casuistry, and prejudice.'

We consider this pamphlet as well worth the perusal of our readers; and we shall conclude our notice of it, by giving the author's own account of his inquiries relating to one or two cases mentioned by Dr. Moseley; which amply justifies the conclusion that the Doctor has attended much more to the quantity than the quality of his evidence. One of the cases is that of a child 6 years old, who was inoculated with vaccine matter by Mr. Ring, and had the cow-pox in May 1800, but is stated to have had the small-pox in the natural way, nine months afterward. The result of an examination of the parents, by Mr. Merriman, accompanied by a friend, is as follows:

* See p. 427 of this Number.

'That

'That the boy was inoculated for the Cow Pox by Mr. Ring; that some months after, the exact time the mother cannot recollect, he had, what *she* thought, the Small Pox. That she shewed the child, whilst under the eruption, to Mr. Leighton, Surgeon, of Welbeck Street, and Mr. Draper, Apothecary, of Bulstrode Street, Marylebone; who both declared that the eruption was the *chicken pox*; that they both saw it when it was at or near the height; that Dr. Moseley did not see the child during the time of the eruption, nor did any other medical man, except those above mentioned; that a gentleman, who she supposes was Dr. Moseley, came to her about two or three months ago, and inquired if her child had not had the Small Pox after Vaccination, to which she replied she thought he had; Dr. Moseley, *without making any inquiry into particulars*, said, there was no doubt about it. She further said, that the eruption continued out only a few days, *she is positive not a week*, and she believes the eruption was dried away at the end of five days at the farthest.

'There are very visible on the breast several marks left by this eruption.'

As an instance of the disadvantages produced on the constitution by cow-pox, Dr. Moseley states that the elder son of Mr. Englefield, of Kentish Town, who had been vaccinated by Mr. Sandys, 'soon after the inoculation, broke out in violent ulcerations, and died in a miserable manner.' Mr. Merriman informs us that he is authorized by Mr. Sandys to contradict this report: 'Mr. Sandys (says he) stated to me expressly, that the elder child, as well as his brother, recovered perfectly from the Vaccination; that a slight eruption on the skin, altogether distinct from and independent of the Cow-pox, afterwards appeared, but that there was nothing at all uncommon or alarming in this eruption; that about three months after being vaccinated, the eldest son was attacked with a peripneumony, of which he died.'

Art. 24. *Observations addressed to the Public in general on the Cow-Pox*, shewing that it originates in Scrophula, commonly called the Evil; illustrated with Cases to prove that it is no Security against the Small-Pox. Also pointing out the dreadful Consequences of this new Disease, so recently and rashly introduced into the human Constitution. To which are added, Observations on the Small-Pox Inoculation, proving it to be more beneficial to Society than the Vaccine. By R. Squirrell, M. D. formerly resident Apothecary to the Small Pox and Inoculation Hospital. 8vo. pp. 75. 2s. 6d. Highley.

On reading the title page of this work, we expected to have found it the vehicle of some empirical nostrum; and we think that the author has exercised a great degree of forbearance, in withholding for the space of 75 pages, the recommendation of some of his celebrated medicines. The attention of the public is arrested in every part of the town with the author's advertisements, of formidable magnitude: and we have only to observe of this pamphlet, that it does not disgrace the mode adopted by him for giving it publicity.

Art. 25. *A Letter to Wm. Wilberforce, Esq. M. P. &c. &c. &c.* by Jas. Carmichael Smyth, M. D. containing Remarks on a Pamphlet,

entitled an Account of the Discovery of the Power of Mineral Acid Vapours to destroy Contagion, by John Johnstone, M. D. published in London in 1803. 8vo. pp. 34. 1s. Callow. 1805.

Dr. Johnstone's pamphlet was intended to invalidate both Dr. Smith's and Mr. Morvean's claim to the discovery of the efficacy of mineral acid vapour in destroying contagion; and to substantiate that of his father, who mentioned the use of the vapour of muriatic acid so early as the year 1758, and was afterward in the habit of recommending it for the cure of fever. Dr. Smyth here vindicates his right to the discovery of the efficacy of nitrous vapour, and contends that there is no reason for considering Dr. Johnstone, sen. as the first person who was in the habit of employing the vapour of muriatic acid to destroy contagion

From the remarks made by Dr. John Johnstone, in the pamphlet to which this is an answer, we were disposed to consider the claim of his father to the discovery of the effects of muriatic vapour as substantiated; and still it appears that the employment of that vapour, in fever rooms, was mentioned by Dr. Johnstone, sen. so early as the year 1758. There does not, however, seem to be any reason for supposing that Dr. Johnstone had been much accustomed to use it, nor that he placed any great dependence on it; much less that he had, as his son states, 'acquired eminence by the discovery of a certain method of destroying infection, which could be used with perfect convenience in the apartments of the sick.' The passage relating to this subject, in Dr. Johnstone's original work, is as follows. After having mentioned the use of myrrh, amber, benzoin, camphire, and vinegar, he adds,

"These are the *most commodious, if not the most useful methods of medicating* the air *the patient breathes;* however, *those who prefer the mineral acids, may order brimstone to be burnt,* or *may raise the marine acids very easily*, by putting a certain quantity of common salt into a vessel, kept heated on a chafing dish of coals; if to this a small quantity of oil of vitriol is from time to time added, the air will be filled with a thick white acid steam; but both *the marine and sulphureous acids must be disengaged at a considerable distance from the patient, otherwise their extreme pungency will be offensive to the lungs.*"

Dr. Johnstone's mode of recommending muriatic fumigation is very equivocal; and, unless there was evidence of his having afterward employed it with freedom, little can be inferred with regard to his opinion of its efficacy. Dr. Smyth throws some blame on Dr. J. jun. for asserting that his father represented the evolution of muriatic acid fumes from common salt as the *most effectual* mode of freeing the air from putrefaction; whereas it certainly does appear, in the original work, that the circumstance is mentioned as a matter on which little stress is laid. Dr. Smyth informs us that, in the rules for avoiding the influence of contagion given by Dr. Johnstone, sen. in the same work from which the above extract is made, no notice is taken of the mineral acids; which notice he thinks would have occurred, if they had possessed that share of his good opinion which his son would intimate. Another circumstance, too, Dr. Smyth states as deserving

remark, viz. that Dr. James Johnstone, (another son of Dr. Johnstone) who published a Thesis on Angina Maligna in the year 1773, says nothing of the use of the muriatic acid, though that thesis was admitted to have been written under the immediate inspection of his father.

The author seems rather to quibble on the words *order* and *recommend*, when he represents it as a great want of candour in Dr. Johnstone to employ the latter term, instead of the former, in speaking of the use which his father made of the marine-acid-vapour in his practice. However great be the difference in meaning between the two words, it is at least certain that they are not unfrequently employed by medical men as synonimes; and that a man never *orders*, or at least ought never to order, what he cannot *recommend*.

On the whole, though the use of the marine-acid-vapour was noticed in the year 1758 by Dr. Johnstone, sen. there seems to be no reason for concluding that he considered it as a certain method of destroying infection, or that he was much in the habit of employing it; and the practice might have been lost, but for the attention drawn to it by M. Morveau.—With regard to the claims which Dr. Smyth possesses to public gratitude, for the use of nitrous-acid vapour as a destroyer of contagion, instead of that of muriatic acid, it by no means appears to us that the transition from the one to the other affords any well-founded pretensions to originality.

Art. 26. *The Lectures of Boyer on the Diseases of the Bones*, arranged into a systematic Treatise, by A. Richerand, Professor of Anatomy and Philosophy, and Principal Surgeon to the Northern Hospital at Paris. Translated from the French by M. Farrell, M. D. 8vo. 2 Vols. 15s. Boards. Murray.

As far as we have compared this translation with the original, it seems to be executed with care and fidelity. We have lately had occasion to give our opinion on the merits of the Lectures*, and have nothing farther to add on the subject at present.

Art. 27. *Transactions of the Perkinean Society*, consisting of a Report on the Practice with the Metallic Tractors, at the Institution in Frith Street, and Experiments communicated by several Correspondents. Published by the Committee. 12mo. 1s. Johnson. 1804.

Perkinism seems to be much indebted to clergymen; since, of ten correspondents whose communications are here inserted to record the value of the practice, one half are gentlemen of the cloth. The committee are, however, armed at all points; for, of the remaining five, three are medical gentlemen, *retired from practice*, who are professed to have been regularly educated, and must therefore be supposed to observe with precision and report with accuracy. Some of the cases adduced by the latter are rather too favourable; and we doubt whether Mr. Perkins himself (unless he has disposed of his patent,) would, for the credit of his tractors, wish to see many instances recorded of total blindness produced by small pox, and existing several years, so

* Rev. Vol. xliv. N. S. *Appendix.*

much removed by the tractors in the course of 25 minutes, as to allow the patient to see surrounding objects; and perfectly cured in three weeks. We shall expect in time to hear that the Promethean effects of Perkinism will not only heal the maimed, the halt, and the blind, but impart a vital energy to a wooden leg, or a glass eye.

Art. 28. *A Conspectus of the London and Edinburgh Pharmacopœias*, &c. By Robt. Graves, M.D. F.L.S. &c. Third Edition, corrected, and adapted to the last improved Editions of the Colleges. 12mo. pp. 112. 3s 6d sewed. Highley.

The first edition of this little work was noticed with approbation soon after its appearance, in our 21st Vol. N. S. p. 95. In the present, the author has availed himself, in many instances, of additional information on the use of medicines, and has supplied such as have since been inserted in the last edition of the Edinburgh Pharmacopœia. The revolution, which has taken place in the nomenclature of the latter, prevents it from assimilating, so well as formerly, with the Dispensatory of the London College; and indeed it is to be regretted that the two Colleges should not act in some degree in concert, and thus prevent the embarrassment produced by the difference of synonimes now existing. Dr. Graves has annexed a table which gives the new nomenclature of the Edinburgh College.

Art. 29. *An Essay upon Pestilential Diseases*; such as the Putrid, Malignant, and Yellow Fevers, and the Plague, &c. &c. By James Rymer, Surgeon, R. N. 8vo. pp. 56. 2s. Highley. 1805.

The burthen of this song is, that Mr. Rymer is the inventor and proprietor of the *Nervous and Cardiac Tincture*, which is sold at a guinea per bottle, is a preventative and curer of infectious fevers, is a powerful tonic and antiseptic, and is at the same time gently aperient.

POLITICAL.

Art. 30. *A Sketch of the present State of France.* By an Englishman, who escaped from Paris in the Month of May last. 8vo. 3s. 6d. sewed. R. Phillips. 1805.

With all true Britons, we should rejoice in the authentication of many of the statements exhibited in this view of France; but, as we cannot yield to the weakness of suffering our wishes to sway our judgment, we must require better evidence for the facts here recorded, before we can receive them with confidence. Though such accounts as that now before us be detailed with a patriotic motive, we doubt whether vilifying representations of the enemy, and degrading estimates of his resources, are calculated to serve any good purpose. These may indeed contribute for the present to elevate our hopes, and to assuage our fears: but truth is ultimately preferable to deception; and, while miserable must be the situation of that country which is forced to resort for comfort to misrepresentation and exaggeration, still more miserable will ultimately be its fate. We hope that Great Britain is not arrived at such an alarming crisis as to require any means to be employed against our inveterate enemy, but those

And starting at the well-known sound,
The gard'ners from their pallets bound;
The scar'd musician this pursues,
That stops him with insidious noose;
Now to a tree behold him tied,
Whilst both prepare to take his hide.
But first his cudgel either rears,
And plies his ribs, his nose, his ears;
His head converted to a jelly,
His back confounded with his belly;
All bruis'd without, all broke within,
To leaves they now convert his skin;
Whereon, in characters of gold,
For all good asses, young and old,
This short instructive tale is told.

What an admirable lesson for those who *will* sing in spite of nature!

ART. 23.—*The Minstrel, or the Progress of Genius; with some other Poems. By James Beattie, LL. D. A new Edition; to which are prefixed, Memoirs of the Life of the Author, by Alex. Chalmers, Esq.* 8vo. Mawman. 1805.

WE are not at present called upon to analyse the works of this pleasing poet, who has long since received the crown of bays; and whose volume is placed by his admirers upon the same shelf with Gray, Mason, Cowper, and the rest of those poetical worthies, with whom, as old Nestor says of the friends of his youth, not one of the present race of mortal men is able to contend. The present edition of his poems claims, however, our notice from the Memoirs of the Author's Life, which are prefixed. Mr. Chalmers having been connected with the poet in the relations, first of pupil, and afterwards of friend, is fully adequate to the task he has undertaken, and it may be said in general, that without running out into a circumstantial prolixity, he has told us in a pleasing manner all that was desirable to be known.

ART. 24.—*Ballads, by William Hayley, Esq. founded on Anecdotes relating to Animals, with Prints, &c.* 8vo. Phillips. 1805.

INDIVIDUALS differ much in their ideas of Mr. Hayley's merits. Some think that he is not entirely destitute of poetical talents, while others are of opinion that any person might write a hundred such verses as Mr. Hayley's standing on one leg. We shall not now discuss this point, but confine ourselves merely to the performance before us, which at all events, possesses no merit. The author informs us in a short preface, that it is intended for children; but we may say, as the mischievous sister of Sir Charles Grandison said of her husband's collection of moths and butterflies, that few children will be found childish enough to be amused by it.

MEDICINE.

ART. 25.—*Observations on some late Attempts to depreciate the Value and Efficacy of Vaccine Inoculation. By Samuel Merriman* 8vo. *pp.* 35. Murray. 1805.

WE have perused with much satisfaction these calm, candid, and rational 'Observations;' and earnestly recommend them to the attention of all those whose confidence in the cow-pox may have been shaken by the declamatory effusions of Dr. Moseley. The greater part of Dr. M.'s deductions, Mr. Merriman justly observes, are formed according to the absurd and exploded axiom, '*post hoc, ergo propter hoc.*' And among the dire consequences of vaccine inoculation, which he has described, not one disease is mentioned (save the *green itch*, which no practitioner has seen) which has not long been familiar to medical men in this country; but 'to attribute those diseases to vaccination, which are the same now as they have been for fifty years past, which are curable in the same way, and which do not occur oftener than formerly, is a strong mark of want of candour, liberality, and proper investigation.' P. 25. Mr. Merriman takes a slight retrospective view of the opposition which was made to the inoculation of the small-pox, and it appears, that a very similar catalogue of eruptions, wastings, and 'bodily defœdations,' was made out by the prejudiced antagonists of that valuable practice. The case of Miss Rolt, which was published by Dr. Bryan Robinson, and attested by the Hon. Mrs. Rolt, the lady's mother, contains a more dismal history of ulcers, imposthumes, and rattling bones, the consequence of small-pox inoculation, than any which Dr. Moseley has attributed to the vaccine disease. And Howgrave's triumphant exclamation on the subject is, *mutatis mutandis*, the prototype of some of Dr. M.'s. Of the manner of Dr. M.'s argumentation, we have intimated enough. We shall now quote a passage or two from Mr. Merriman's pamphlet, ralative to the authenticity of his facts. The third case in Dr. Moseley's appendix is as follows: 'Richard Curling, aged nearly six years, son of Mr. Curling, No. 18, George-street, Portland chapel, had the cow-pox in May 1800; inoculated by Mr. Ring, apothecary in Swallow-street, Hanover square. Nine months after he had the small pox in the natural way; he had ulcerations about his body, and was otherwise much disordered after the cow pox.' But what is the account which Mrs. Curling gave to Mr. Merriman and Mr. Henning? 'That the boy was inoculated for the cow-pox by Mr. Ring; that some months after, the exact time she cannot recollect, he had, what *she* thought the small-pox. That she shewed the child, whilst under the eruption, to Mr. Leighton, surgeon of Welbeck-street, and Mr. Draper, apothecary of Bulstrode-street; who both declared that the eruption was the *chicken-pox;* that they both saw it when it was at or near the height; that Dr. Moseley did not see the child during the time of the eruption, nor did any other medical man, except those

above mentioned; that a gentleman, who she supposes was Dr. Moseley, came to her about two or three months ago, and inquired if her child had not had the small-pox after vaccination, to which she replied she thought he had; and Dr. Moseley, *without making any inquiry into particulars*, said there was no doubt about it. She further said, that the eruption continued out only a few days, *she is positive not a week*, and she believes the eruption was dried away at the end of five days at the farthest.' P. 28. This statement requires no comment. Mr. M. has also been authorised to contradict another erroneous report which Dr. M. has circulated. P. 34. But *jam satis*. Mr. Merriman candidly admits that we have yet much to learn respecting the action, the powers, and the laws of the cow-pox. And, persuaded as we are of the truth of the general fact, we hope this pamphlet will be circulated wherever Dr. Moseley's has appeared, that it may at least suspend the hasty and crude conclusions, which the latter is calculated to produce.

leading men amongst them entertained strong doubts of the expediency of agitating the question, and that want of success was not unexpected, nor felt as a disappointment. Mr. Dillon is mistaken if he thinks he has essentially served the cause of the Catholics. There is nothing new in his arguments; but, what is worse, the manner and the spirit which characterize his letter, are calculated to increase, and not to diminish opposition.

He quotes with much approbation an observation made by Mr. Fox, that this was a subject upon which the people of England had much to be taught. It may safely be added, it is a subject upon which the Catholics have much to learn.

Let Mr. Dillon, therefore, be satisfied that it is a subject not yet ripe for decision. Without suddenly granting the full claims of the Catholics, much may be done in the gradual improvement of their condition; and in the continued exercise of moderation and good sense; their admission to equal privileges with their fellow-citizens will ultimately take place as an event naturally arising from established confidence and reciprocal interests. While it is treated as a